

about this time of year and then we spend some time coloring it and off we go. But, Senator Bromm, it's his intent the one that I have some problem with, and it goes like this. You've got a...you want to add some service out there like birth or death certificates. You are now frozen at that fee that we have in statute today. You can't...you can't allow for any extra fee to be charged for that record for access, and we throw around terms, but what's crucial here is that they have that record, they've collected it, they've maintained it. Does it cost much to type some information on a piece of paper? No, not really, probably pennies, but it is the maintenance of it, it's the system of filing and hiring the people that take care of the record. What we are talking about here is accessing a record that we already have. Now if you're...if you're sitting in Scottsbluff, Nebraska, how much is it worth to you to get that record? Now if you're here and you can walk over there and pick it up, you don't mind paying that fee. I mean, it's every fee is too high, don't get me wrong, but that fee has been acceptable and people have been paying them. The world hasn't come to an end on death certificates or birth certificates and a lot of people use those sorts of things. But if you are in someplace other than Lincoln, Nebraska, and you want a copy of that or you want to get that information, and you can electronically access it, what you are doing with Senator Bromm's subsection (4) is saying, look, you are not going to allow these anymore, because the practical effect is no company will provide that service without at least trying to make some additional profit on it because that's how they are going to pay to put the service out there. And maybe they will do it as a loss-leader, and maybe that's what we will do from now on for the next two years, but, quite frankly, that's going to be the practical impact of this is that you are not going to have those other services placed on electronically because of the uncertainty of the time frame, but you are also not going to allow anybody to charge anything extra to provide the access to it. We are not talking about maintaining the record, we are talking about the access to it, and that's what you're paying the premium for is access. You are not paying the premium to get the record, the physical information. It is the access to that, and I don't know where this amendment is going to go. To probably be consistent, the Chambers amendment fits with Senator Bromm's intent, and my problem is I just happen to disagree with Senator Bromm's intent of what he wants to do with no new fees. At the same time, I would agree with Senator Bromm that I don't